

### Remarks

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated October 24, 2007. By the present amendment, Claims 1, 15, 28 and 29 have been amended, and new Claims 30-32 has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-32 are currently pending in this case.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to data only, which is considered to be non-statutory subject matter. Claims 28-29 have been amended.

Amended Claim 28 recites a "computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure". The computer-readable medium defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the medium, which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. Accordingly, amended Claims 28-29 comprise statutory subject matter.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to software only, which is considered to lack patentable utility. Claim 1 has been amended.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a "system for automated secure digital mobile video monitoring and recording . . . comprising: a mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem having at least one video camera . . . a video management subsystem . . . for storage, viewing and verification of the digitally watermarked video data on demand; and a secure wireless video transfer subsystem . . . for automatically transferring the digitally watermarked

video data whenever the mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem moves within wireless range of the video management subsystem.”

Here, while a system may include software, the presently claimed system is not entirely software. Amended Claim 1 recites a “video camera”. In addition, the video management subsystem is configured for “viewing”, which means a physical display for viewing a real and useful physical output. Further, a “wireless video transfer subsystem” is understood in the art to mean at least a physical transmitter for transferring radio signals, electromagnetic transmissions, or the like. Electromagnetic transmissions are another real and useful physical output. Accordingly, amended Claim 1, as well as Claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14, which depend therefrom, have patentable utility.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Digital Rights Management and Watermarking of Multimedia Content for M-Commerce Applications, by Hartung et al. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Support for these amended claims is inherent in the application as originally filed. See *also*, Application at page 10, lines 3-20. No new matter has been added.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a “A system for automated secure digital mobile video monitoring and recording . . . comprising: a mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem having at least one video camera for capturing and simultaneously digitally watermarking video data in real-time; a video management subsystem in intermittent signal communication with the

mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem for storage, viewing and verification of the digitally watermarked video data on demand; and a secure wireless video transfer subsystem in signal communication between the acquisition and management subsystems for automatically transferring the digitally watermarked video data whenever the mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem moves within wireless range of the video management subsystem.”

The paper by Hartung et al. is generally directed towards digital rights management and watermarking for electronic commerce applications. See Hartung at Abstract. Hartung addresses commercial multi-media productions that have digital rights management watermarking applied during subsequent editing and prior to public release. Thus, Hartung et al. fail to contemplate, much less teach or suggest, at least “mobile authenticated acquisition subsystem . . . for capturing and simultaneously digitally watermarking video data in real-time” as recited in amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 15 recites comparable features.

In addition, Hartung fail to teach or suggest “combining in a single watermark a robust identity signature to establish the identity of a watermarked mobile video recording (MVR) and to indicate the presence of a watermark, and a semi-fragile control signature to facilitate the characterization of the type of modifications done to a watermarked MVR” as recited in new Claims 30 and 32, which depend from amended Claims 1 and 15, respectively. Further, Hartung fails to contemplate “robust identity signature comprises error-correcting signature coding to characterize the severity of content alteration; and the semi-

fragile control signature comprises rate-distortion guided bit embedding to localize content tampering” as recited in new Claim 31.

Accordingly, amended Claims 1 and 15 are neither taught nor suggested by Hartung et al. Moreover, new Claims 30-32, which recite additional patentable features, are neither taught nor suggested by Hartung et al.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robust Watermarking of Cartographic Images, by Barni et al. Claim 28 has been amended. Support for this amended claim is inherent in the application as originally filed. *See also*, Application at page 10, lines 3-20. No new matter has been added.

Amended Claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, a “computer-readable medium encoded with . . . block transform coefficients . . . collectively indicative of an original video data sequence with a secure invisible watermark, the secure watermark comprising a plurality of signatures, including a robust identity signature to establish the identity of a watermarked mobile video recording (MVR) and to indicate the presence of a watermark, and a semi-fragile control signature to facilitate the characterization of the type of modifications done to a watermarked MVR.”

The paper by Barni et al. is generally directed towards robust watermarking of still (motionless) cartographic images (e.g., aerial photographs and maps) comprising added text. *See* Barni, first paragraph. Barni et al. rely on the presence of text in these still images. This is a unique application that is

inapposite to Applicants' "video data sequence" and "watermarked mobile video recording", as recited in Claim 28. Further, Barni's addition of text to the original still images teaches away from Applicants' "coefficients collectively indicative of an original video data sequence with a secure invisible watermark", as also recited in amended Claim 28. Moreover, Barni et al. fail to even contemplate "a semi-fragile control signature to facilitate the characterization of the type of modifications done to a watermarked MVR", as further recited in amended Claim 28.

### Conclusion

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1, 15 and 28 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. Since the remaining dependent Claims each depend from one of the above claims and necessarily include each of the elements and limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated, as well as for reciting additional patentable subject matter. Thus, each of Claims 1-32 is in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, reconsideration of the rejections and an early and favorable allowance of this case are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by: 

Eric M. Parham  
Reg. No. 45,747  
Attorney for Applicants

### Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
Telephone: (516) 692-8888  
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889